arXiv:0910.3436v1 [math.AP] 19 Oct 2009

# Schrödinger-Poisson system with steep potential well*

Yongsheng Jiang and Huan-Song Zhou†
Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics
Chinese Academy of Sciences, P.O.Box 71010, Wuhan 430071, China

Abstract: We study the following Schrödinger-Poisson system

$$(P_\lambda)\begin{cases} -\Delta u+(1+\mu g(x))u+\lambda\phi(x)u=|u|^{p-1}u,\ \ x\in\mathbb{R}^3,\\ -\Delta\phi=u^2,\ \lim\limits_{|x|\to+\infty}\phi(x)=0,\end{cases}$$

where $\lambda,\mu$ are positive parameters, $p\in(1,5)$, $g(x)\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is nonnegative and $g(x)\equiv 0$ on a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $g(x)\not\equiv g(|x|)$. For $\mu=0$, ($\mathrm{P}_\lambda$) was studied by Ruiz [J. Funct. Anal., 237(2006), 655-674]. However, if $\mu\neq 0$ and $g(x)$ is not radially symmetric, it is unknown whether ($\mathrm{P}_\lambda$) has a nontrivial solution for $p\in(1,2)$. In this paper, combining domain approximation and priori estimate we establish the boundedness and compactness of a (PS) sequence, then we prove for $\mu>0$ large that ($\mathrm{P}_\lambda$) with $p\in(1,2)$ has a ground state if $\lambda>0$ small and that ($\mathrm{P}_\lambda$) for $p\in[3,5)$ has a nontrivial solution for all $\lambda>0$. Moreover, some behaviors of the solutions of ($\mathrm{P}_\lambda$) as $\lambda\to 0$, $\mu\to+\infty$ and $|x|\to+\infty$ are also discussed.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with the existence of nontrivial solutions of the following Schrödinger-Poisson system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u+V_\mu(x)u+\lambda\phi(x)u=|u|^{p-1}u,\ \ x\in\mathbb{R}^3,\\ -\Delta\phi=u^2,\ \lim\limits_{|x|\to+\infty}\phi(x)=0,\ \ x\in\mathbb{R}^3,\end{cases}\tag{1.1}$$

where $V_\mu(x)=1+\mu g(x)$, $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are positive parameters, $p\in(1,5)$ and $g(x)$ satisfies

---

[*] This work was supported by NSFC and CAS-KJCX3-SYW-S03.

[†] Corresponding author: hszhou@wipm.ac.cn.

*2000 Mathematical Subject Classification*: 35J60. *Key words*: Schrödinger-Poisson, priori estimate, potential well, ground state, exponential decay.

(G$_1$) $g(x) \geqslant 0$, $g(x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

(G$_2$) $\Omega_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : g(x) = 0\}$ is bounded and has nonempty interior.

(G$_3$) $\liminf\limits_{|x|\to\infty} g(x) = 1$. (Here 1 can be replaced by any positive number)

Problem (1.1) arisen in quantum mechanics, which is related to the study of nonlinear Schrödinger equation for a particle in an electromagnetic field or the Hatree-Fock equation, etc., see [6, 7, 10, 12, 17] and the references therein. If $\mu = 0$, the existence of solutions of problem (1.1) has been discussed for different ranges of $p$, for examples, [9] [10] [12] for $p \in [3, 5)$, [4] for $p \in (2, 5)$, [16] for $p \in [2, 3)$ and [2] [17][3] for $p \in (1, 5)$ or general nonlinearity, etc. For some $\lambda_0 > 0$, it was proved in [16] that (1.1) with $\mu = 0$ and $p \in (1, 2]$ has no nontrivial solution if $\lambda \geqslant \lambda_0$. Ruiz in [17] proved that $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{4}$ and that (1.1) has solution if $\lambda > 0$ small enough. Some recent results in this direction was summarized in [1]. However, if $\mu \neq 0$, there are only a few results on (1.1) for $p \in (2, 5)$ and some special potential functions, such as [4, 22, 20, 21]. In [4], a ground state of (1.1) with $p \in (3, 5)$ was obtained if $V_\mu(x)$ satisfies

(V$_1$) $V_\infty = \lim\limits_{|y|\to+\infty} V_\mu(y) \geqslant V_\mu(x)$ a.e. in $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, and the strict inequality holds on a positive measure set.

It was also proved in [22] that (1.1) still has a ground state for $p \in (2, 3]$ if (V$_1$) holds and $V_\mu(x)$ is weakly differentiable function such that

(V$_2$) $(\nabla V_\mu(x), x) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \cup L^{3/2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $2V_\mu(x) + (\nabla V_\mu(x), x) \geqslant 0$ a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the usual inner product in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

If $-\Delta u$ is replaced by $-\varepsilon\Delta u$ in (1.1), the semiclassical states for this kind of problem was discussed very recently in [18, 21] for special $V_\mu(x)$, and in [11] for $\mu = 0$, etc. Problem (1.1) with asymptotically linear nonlinearity was considered in [20]. To the authors' knowledge, it seems still open if there exists a solution to problem (1.1) with $\mu \neq 0$ and $p \in (1, 2)$. It is known that (V$_1$) is crucial in using concentration compactness principle if $V_\mu(x)$ is not radially symmetric, (V$_2$) is important in getting the boundedenss of a (PS) sequence. In this paper, we assume neither the conditions of (V$_1$) and (V$_2$) nor that the potential $V_\mu(x)$ is radially symmetric. These lead to several difficulties in using variational method to get solutions of (1.1). The first is to prove that a (PS) sequence is bounded in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which is known to be hard for $p \in (1, 2)$ because of the presence of the so called nonlocal term "$\phi(x)u$" in (1.1). If $\mu = 0$, we can overcome this difficulty by using the decay property of functions in $H^1_r(\mathbb{R}^3)$ [17], but this trick does not work when $V_\mu(x)$ is not radially symmetric. Once we get a bounded (PS) sequence, then we have to find a new way to prove that the (PS) sequence converges to a solution because the concentration compactness principle cannot be used in our case due to the lack of conditions ($\mathrm{V}_1$) etc. In this paper, we first consider the problem (1.1) on $B_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| < k\}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and we can easily get a solution $u_k$ of (1.1) in $H^1_0(B_k)$ since the Sobolev embedding $H^1_0(B_k) \hookrightarrow L^q(B_k)$ for $q \in (1, 6)$ is compact. Then, we establish a uniform priori estimate of $L^\infty$ norm of $u_k$. Finally, by adapting some techniques used in [20], we prove that $\{u_k\}$ converges to a nontrivial solution of (1.1). Moreover, a ground state of (1.1) for $p \in (1, 2)$ is also proved in Section 6. However, our methods seem not useful for $p \in [2, 3)$.

**Notations:** Throughout this paper, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $B_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x| < k\}$ and define

$$C^1_B(\mathbb{R}^3) = \{u \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } |\nabla u| \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)\}, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\mathscr{D}_V = \{u \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} V_\mu(x)u^2 dx < +\infty\}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\mathscr{D}_k = \{u \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}_0(B_k) : \int_{B_k} V_\mu(x)u^2 dx < +\infty\}. \tag{1.4}$$

Clearly, $\mathscr{D}_V$ and $\mathscr{D}_k$ are Hilbert spaces, their scalar products are given by

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{\mathscr{D}_V} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u \nabla v + V_\mu(x)uvdx, \quad \text{for any } u, v \in \mathscr{D}_V, \tag{1.5}$$

$$\langle u, v\rangle_k = \int_{B_k} \nabla u \nabla v + V_\mu(x)uvdx, \quad \text{for any } u, v \in \mathscr{D}_k. \tag{1.6}$$

The norms of $\mathscr{D}_V$ and $\mathscr{D}_k$ are introduced by

$$\|u\|^2_{\mathscr{D}_V} = \langle u, u\rangle_{\mathscr{D}_V}, \quad \|u\|^2_k = \langle u, u\rangle_k. \tag{1.7}$$

Clearly, $\|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{D}_V}$ is an equivalent norm of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. For $p \in [1, +\infty]$, we denote the usual norm of $L^p(\Omega)$ by $|\cdot|_{L^p(\Omega)}$, and simply by $|\cdot|_p$ if $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$.

Moreover, for any $u \in \mathscr{D}_k$, the extension of $u$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ is defined by

$$\tilde{u}(x) = u(x) \text{ if } x \in B_k, \quad \tilde{u}(x) = 0 \text{ if } x \in B^c_k. \tag{1.8}$$

For $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$, let $\phi_u$ be the unique solution of $-\Delta\phi = u^2$ in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ [Lemma 2.1 below], define

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + V(x)u^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u(x)u^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p+1}(x)dx. \tag{1.9}$$

By [10, Proposition 2.1], $I \in C^1(\mathscr{D}_V, \mathbb{R})$ and for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V$ we have

$$I'(u)\varphi = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u \nabla \varphi + V(x)u\varphi dx + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u u\varphi dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p-1}u\varphi dx. \tag{1.10}$$

Moreover, if $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ and $I'(u)\varphi = 0$ for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V$, Lemma 2.4 of [10] showed that $u$ and $\phi_u$ (simply by $\phi$, sometimes) satisfy (1.1) in the weak sense.

**Definition 1.1** *A pairs $(u, \phi) \in \mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is said to be a (weak) solution of (1.1) if*

$$I'(u)\varphi = 0 \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V. \tag{1.11}$$

For the sake of simplicity, in many cases we just say $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$, instead of $(u, \phi_u) \in \mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, is a weak solution of (1.1).
We end this section by giving our main results.

**Theorem 1.1** *Let $p \in (1, 2)$ and $(\mathrm{G}_1)$ to $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ hold. Then there exists $\lambda_* \in (0, +\infty)$ and $C_{p,\lambda} = 2^{\frac{2}{p-2}}(2-p)^{\frac{2p-1}{p-1}}\left[p(p-1)\lambda^{-1}\right]^{\frac{p}{2-p}}$ such that problem (1.1) has one nontrivial solution $(u, \phi) \in \mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ and $\mu > \mu_1 = C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 1$. Moreover,*

$$I(u) \in [\alpha, c_\lambda], \ \|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla\phi|_2 \leqslant M_\mu := M(p, \lambda, \mu), \ \text{and}$$

$$|u(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}, \ 0 < \phi(x) \leqslant C_\mu := C(p, \lambda, \mu) \ \text{ a.e. in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

*where $\alpha, c_\lambda > 0$ are independent of $\mu$, and $M_\mu$ is decreasing in $\mu$.*

**Remark 1.1** *We claim that $\lambda_* \leqslant c(p) = \frac{1}{4}(p-1)^2(2-p)^{2\frac{2-p}{p-1}}$. In fact, similar to the proof of [17, Theorem 4.1], we see that (1.1) has no any nontrivial solution in $\mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ if $\lambda \geqslant c(p)$. Moreover, it is not difficult to check that $C_{p,\lambda} > 1$ if $\lambda \in (0, c(p))$. Hence $\mu_1 > 0$ in Theorem 1.1.*

By Theorem 1.1 and Remark 1.1, we know that the existence of solutions of (1.1) for $p \in (1, 2)$ depends heavily on the parameter $\lambda$. However, if $p \in [3, 5)$, the situation is quite different and we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2** *Let* $p \in [3,5)$ *and* $(\mathrm{G}_1)$ *to* $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ *hold. Then, for any* $\lambda > 0$*, there exist positive constants* $M_0 := M_0(\lambda)$*,* $M_1 := M_1(\lambda)$ *and* $M := M(\lambda)$*, which are independent of* $\mu$ *and nondecreasing in* $\lambda > 0$*, such that problem (1.1) has one nontrivial solution* $(u,\phi) \in \mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *if* $\mu > \mu_2 = \max\{0, M_0(\lambda)^{p-1} - 1\}$*, and* $(u,\phi)$ *satisfies*

$$|u(x)| \leqslant M_0 \text{ and } 0 < \phi(x) \leqslant M_1 \text{ a.e. in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \ \|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla\phi|_2 \leqslant M.$$

*Moreover, there exist* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $c_\lambda > 0$*, independent of* $\mu$*, such that* $I_\lambda(u) \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$ *where* $\alpha$ *is also independent of* $\lambda > 0$*.*

The following three theorems describe how the solutions of (1.1) behave when $\lambda \to 0$, $\mu \to +\infty$ and $|x| \to +\infty$, respectively.

**Theorem 1.3** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2. For each* $\lambda > 0$ *and* $\mu > \mu_2$*, let* $u_\lambda$ *denote the solution of (1.1) obtained by Theorem 1.2. Then there exists a solution* $u_0 \in \mathscr{D}_V \setminus \{0\}$ *for (1.1) with* $\lambda = 0$ *such that, along a subsequence,*

$$u_\lambda \to u_0 \quad \text{strongly in } \mathscr{D}_V \quad \text{as } \lambda \to 0.$$

**Theorem 1.4** *For each* $\mu > 0$ *large, let* $u_\mu$ *be a solution of (1.1) obtained by Theorem 1.1 or 1.2. Then, there is* $\bar{u} \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *with* $\bar{u}(x) = 0$ *a.e. in* $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_0$ *and* $\bar{u}(x) \not\equiv 0$ *in* $\Omega_0$ *such that, passing to a subsequence,*

$$u_\mu \to \bar{u} \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ as } \mu \to +\infty.$$

*Moreover, if* $\partial\Omega_0$ *is Lipschitz continuous, then* $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ *and it is a weak solution of the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u + \frac{\lambda}{4\pi}(u^2 * \frac{1}{|x|})u = |u|^{p-1}u, & x \in \Omega_0, \\ u(x) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega_0. \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

**Theorem 1.5** *For each* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$*, let* $u_\mu$ *be the solutions of (1.1) obtained by Theorem 1.1 or 1.2. If* $\mu > \mu_0 = \max\{3C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 3, 3M_0^{p-1} - 3\}$*, then there exist* $A > 0$ *and* $R_0 > 0$ *which are independent of* $\mu$ *such that*

$$u_\mu(x) \leqslant A|x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}(|x| - R_0)} \quad \text{for } |x| > R_0 \text{ and } \mu > \mu_0.$$

**Theorem 1.6** *For* $\lambda_*$ *and* $\mu_1$ *given by Theorem 1.1, let* $p \in (1,2)$ *and* $(\mathrm{G}_1)$ *to* $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ *hold. Then problem (1.1) has a ground state* $(u,\phi) \in \mathscr{D}_V \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *for each* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ *and* $\mu > \mu_1$*.*

## 2 Nontrivial solution for (1.1) on $B_k$

For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V_\mu(x)u + \lambda\phi(x)u = |u|^{p-1}u, & x \in B_k, \\ -\Delta\phi = u^2, & x \in B_k, \\ u(x) = \phi(x) = 0, & x \in \partial B_k. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

For $u \in \mathscr{D}_k$ and $\phi := \phi_u \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$, define

$$I_k(u) := I_{\lambda,k}(u) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_k} |\nabla u|^2 + V_\mu(x)u^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{B_k} \phi_u(x)u^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{B_k} |u|^{p+1} dx, \tag{2.2}$$

and $I_k \in C^1(\mathscr{D}_k, \mathbb{R})$, $(u, \phi_u) \in \mathscr{D}_k \times \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ is a weak solution of (2.1) if and only if $u$ is a nonzero critical point of $I_k(u)$. The main aim of this section is to prove that

**Theorem 2.1** *Let $p \in (1,2) \cup [3,5)$ and $(\mathrm{G}_1)$ to $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ hold. Then there exist $\lambda_* > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for $k > k_0$, problem (2.1) has at least one nontrivial solution $(u_k, \phi_k) \in \mathscr{D}_k \times \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ with*

$$I_k(u_k) = c_{\lambda,k} \in [\alpha, c_\lambda] \text{ for each } \lambda \in (0, \lambda_*),$$

*where $\lambda_* = +\infty$ if $p \in [3,5)$ and $\lambda_* \in (0, +\infty)$ if $p \in (1,2)$, $\alpha$ and $c_\lambda$ are positive constants independent of $k$ and $\mu$ ( $\alpha$ is also independent of $\lambda$). Moreover, for $k > k_0$, $c_{\lambda_1,k} \leqslant c_{\lambda_2,k}$ if $\lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2$.*

Before proving Theorem 2.1, we recall some results for the following Poisson equation on any smooth domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $\Omega$ may be unbounded,

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\phi(x) = u^2, & x \in \Omega, \\ \phi \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega). \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

The following lemma is a result of Lax-Milgram theorem.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let $u \in L^{12/5}(\Omega)$. Then (2.3) has a unique solution $\phi_u \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ such that*

$$|\nabla\phi_u|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leqslant S_0^{-1/2}|u|^2_{L^{\frac{12}{5}}(\Omega)}, \quad \int_\Omega \phi_u u^2(x)dx \leqslant S_0^{-1}|u|^4_{L^{\frac{12}{5}}(\Omega)}, \tag{2.4}$$

*where $S_0 = \inf\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dx : u \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^6 dx = 1\}$ is the Sobolev constant, which is independent of $\Omega$ and $u$.*

**Lemma 2.2** *([17, Lemma 2.1]) For* $\{u_n\} \subset L^{12/5}(\Omega)$ *with* $u_n \xrightarrow{n} u$ *strongly in* $L^{12/5}(\Omega)$*, let* $\phi_n$ *and* $\phi$ *be the unique solutions of (2.3) corresponding to* $u_n$ *and* $u$*, respectively. Then,*

$$\phi_n \xrightarrow{n} \phi \quad \textit{strongly in } \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega) \quad \textit{and} \quad \int_\Omega \phi_n u_n^2 dx \xrightarrow{n} \int_\Omega \phi u^2 dx.$$

**Lemma 2.3** *Let* $\{u_k\} \subset L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *be such that* $u_k \xrightarrow{k} u$ *strongly in* $L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *for some* $u \in L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$*, and* $\phi_k \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ *be the unique solution of (2.3) with* $\Omega = B_k$ *and* $u = u_k$*. If* $\tilde{\phi}_k$ *is the extension of* $\phi_k$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^3$ *defined as (1.8), then*

$$\tilde{\phi}_k(x) \xrightarrow{k} \phi(x) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{u^2(y)}{|x-y|} dy \quad \textit{strongly in } \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3),$$

*where* $\phi$ *is essentially the unique solution of (2.3) with* $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$*.*

*Proof.* For $u \in L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, by Lemma 2.1 there is a unique $\phi \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\phi \nabla\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 \varphi dx, \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, $\phi(x) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{u^2(y)}{|x-y|} dy$ by Theorem 9.9 of [14]. By Lemma 2.1, there is $C > 0$ independent of $B_k$ and $u_k$ such that

$$|\nabla\tilde{\phi}_k|_2 = \left\{ \int_{B_k} |\nabla\phi_k|^2 dx \right\}^{1/2} \leqslant C|u_k|^2_{L^{12/5}(B_k)} \leqslant C|u_k|^2_{12/5},$$

this implies that $\{\tilde{\phi}_k\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, since $u_k \xrightarrow{k} u$ strongly in $L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Hence, there exists $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\tilde{\phi}_k \overset{k}{\rightharpoonup} \tilde{\phi}$ weakly in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{\phi}_k \nabla\varphi dx \xrightarrow{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{\phi} \nabla\varphi dx, \quad \text{for any } \varphi \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{2.6}$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\phi}_k$, (2.6) yields

$$\int_{B_k} \nabla\phi_k \nabla\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{\phi}_k \nabla\varphi dx \xrightarrow{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{\phi} \nabla\varphi dx, \text{ for any } \varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{2.7}$$

For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, since $B_k \xrightarrow{k} \mathbb{R}^3$ we see that $\mathrm{supp}\varphi \subset B_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large. Noting that $\phi_k$ satisfies (2.3) with $u = u_k$ and $\Omega = B_k$, it follows from $u_k \xrightarrow{k} u$ that

$$\int_{B_k} \nabla\phi_k \nabla\varphi dx = \int_{B_k} u_k^2 \varphi dx + o(1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_k^2 \varphi dx + o(1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 \varphi dx + o(1), \tag{2.8}$$

where and in what follows $o(1)$ denotes the quantity which goes to 0 as $k \to +\infty$. Therefore, combining (2.7) (2.8) and (2.5), we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{\phi} \nabla\varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\phi \nabla\varphi dx, \text{ for any } \varphi \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

So, $\tilde{\phi} \equiv \phi$ in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Taking $\varphi = \tilde{\phi}_k$ and $\phi$ in (2.5) and (2.6), respectively, then,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 \tilde{\phi}_k dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\phi \nabla\tilde{\phi}_k dx \xrightarrow{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx. \tag{2.9}$$

On the other hand,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\tilde{\phi}_k|^2 dx = \int_{B_k} |\nabla\phi_k|^2 dx = \int_{B_k} u_k^2 \phi_k dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u_k^2 \tilde{\phi}_k dx.$$

By $u_k \xrightarrow{k} u$ strongly in $L^{12/5}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, it follows from (2.9) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\tilde{\phi}_k|^2 dx \xrightarrow{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\phi|^2 dx,$$

this implies that $\tilde{\phi}_k \xrightarrow{k} \phi$ in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. $\square$

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.1. For using Mountain Pass Theorem, the following properties for $I_k$ defined by (2.2) are required.

**Lemma 2.4** *Let $p \in (1,2) \cup [3,5)$ and* (G$_1$) *to* (G$_2$) *hold. We have that*

**(i)** *There are $\rho > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ (independent of $k$, $\lambda$ and $\mu$) such that*

$$\inf_{u \in \mathscr{D}_k; \|u\|_k = \rho} I_{\lambda,k}(u) \geqslant \alpha > 0, \text{ for all } \lambda > 0, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**(ii)** *There exist $\lambda_* \in (0,+\infty)$ if $p \in (1,2)$ or $\lambda_* = +\infty$ if $p \in [3,5)$ and $e \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that* $\mathrm{supp} e \subset B_k$, *$\|e\|_k > \rho$ and*

$$I_{\lambda,k}(e) < 0, \text{ for } \lambda \in (0, \lambda_*) \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ large},$$

*where $e$ is independent of $\lambda$ only if $p \in (1,2)$.*

**(iii)** *There is a constant* $c_\lambda > 0$, *independent of* $k$ *and* $\mu$, *such that*

$$c_{\lambda,k} := \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_\lambda} \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda,k}(\gamma(t)) \leqslant c_\lambda < +\infty,$$

*where* $\Gamma_\lambda = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], \mathscr{D}_k) : \gamma(0) = 0, \|\gamma(1)\|_k > \rho, I_{\lambda,k}(\gamma(1)) < 0\}$. *Moreover, for any fixed* $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \alpha \leqslant c_{\lambda_1,k} \leqslant c_{\lambda_2,k}$ *if* $\lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2$.

*Proof.* (**i**) For $q \in (2,6)$, let

$$S = \inf\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + u^2 dx : u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } |u|_q = 1\},$$

which is independent of $k$ and $\mu$. For any $u \in \mathscr{D}_k \subset H_0^1(B_k)$, define $\tilde{u}$ as (1.8) and $\tilde{u} \in \mathscr{D}_V \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then, Sobolev embedding implies that

$$\int_{B_k} |u|^{p+1}dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}|^{p+1}dx \leqslant S^{-\frac{p+1}{2}}\|\tilde{u}\|^{p+1}_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)} \leqslant S^{-\frac{p+1}{2}}\|\tilde{u}\|^{p+1}_{\mathscr{D}_V} = S^{-\frac{p+1}{2}}\|u\|^{p+1}_k.$$

Since $\lambda > 0$ and $\phi_u > 0$, it follows from (2.2) that

$$I_{\lambda,k}(u) \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_k^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}S^{-\frac{p+1}{2}}\|u\|_k^{p+1}.$$

By $p > 1$, it is not difficult to see that there exist positive constants $\rho$, $\alpha$ (independent of $k$, $\lambda$ and $\mu$) such that (i) holds.

(**ii**) We separate the proof into two cases: $p \in (1,2)$ and $p \in [3,5)$.

If $p \in (1,2)$, let $w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus \{0\}$ with supp$w \subset \Omega_0$. Since $\Omega_0 \subset B_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large, there is $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $k > k_0$ and $t > 0$,

$$I_{0,k}(tw) \triangleq I_{\lambda,k}(tw)|_{\lambda=0} = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla w|^2 + w^2 dx - \frac{t^{p+1}}{p+1}\int_{\Omega_0} |w|^{p+1}dx. \quad (2.10)$$

Clearly, there is $t_0 > 0$ large enough such that $e = t_0 w$ satisfying $I_{0,k}(e) < 0$ and $\|e\|_k = t_0\|w\|_{H_0^1(\Omega_0)} > \rho$, here $e$ is independent of $k$, $\lambda$ and $\mu$. Since $I_{\lambda,k}(e) = I_{0,k}(e) + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{\Omega_0} \phi_e e^2 dx$ is continuous in $\lambda \geqslant 0$, combining $I_{0,k}(e) < 0$ and Lemma 2.1 we see that there exists $\lambda_* > 0$ small (independent of $k$ and $\mu$) such that $I_{\lambda,k}(e) < 0$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$.

If $p \in [3,5)$, the above proof for $p \in (1,2)$ still works but by that way $\lambda$ has to be small. However, for $p \in [3,5)$, we can prove that (ii) holds for all $\lambda > 0$, that is $\lambda_* = +\infty$. In fact, by int$\Omega_0 \neq \emptyset$ we may assume that $B_{\varepsilon_0}(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |x - x_0| < \varepsilon_0\} \subset \Omega_0$ for some $x_0 \in \Omega_0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$. Taking $w \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with supp$w \subset B_{\varepsilon_0}(0)$ and letting $w_t(x) =$

$t^2w(t(x-x_0))$, then supp$w_t \subset B_{\varepsilon_0}(x_0)$ for $t>1$, and $B_{\varepsilon_0}(x_0) \subset \Omega_0 \subset B_k$ if $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough. Since $g(x) \equiv 0$ on $\Omega_0$, for $t>1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,k}(w_t) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla w_t|^2 + w_t^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{\Omega_0} \phi_{w_t} w_t^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\Omega_0} |w_t|^{p+1} dx \\ &= \frac{t^3}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{t}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} w^2 dx + \frac{\lambda t^3}{4}\int_{\Omega_0} \phi_w w^2 dx - \frac{t^{2p-1}}{p+1}\int_{\Omega_0} |w|^{p+1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p>2$, $2p-1>3$, we see that, for each $\lambda>0$, there exists $t_0 := t_0(\lambda) > 1$ large (independent of $k$ and $\mu$) such that

$$I_{\lambda,k}(w_{t_0}) < 0 \text{ and } \|w_{t_0}\|_k^2 = \frac{t_0^3}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{t_0}{2}\int_{\Omega_0} w^2 dx > \rho^2.$$

Hence (ii) is proved by taking $e := e_\lambda \triangleq w_{t_0}$ (independent of $k$ and $\mu$).

(**iii**) By the result of part (i), it is obvious that $c_{\lambda,k} \geqslant \alpha > 0$.

For $p \in (1,2) \cup [3,5)$, by part (ii), there always exists $e \in \mathscr{D}_k$ such that $I_{\lambda,k}(e) < 0$. Let $\gamma_0(t) = te$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Then $\gamma_0(t) \in \Gamma_\lambda$ and

$$c_{\lambda,k} \leqslant \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda,k}(\gamma_0(t)) = \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda,k}(te) \triangleq c_\lambda < +\infty.$$

Note that supp$e \subset \Omega_0$ and $e$ is independent of $k$ and $\mu$, so $c_\lambda$ is also independent of $k$ and $\mu$. For each $k > k_0$ and for any $u \in \mathscr{D}_k$, (2.2) implies that $I_{\lambda_1,k}(u) \leqslant I_{\lambda_2,k}(u)$ if $\lambda_1 \leqslant \lambda_2$, then the definition of $\Gamma_\lambda$ yields that $\Gamma_{\lambda_2} \subseteq \Gamma_{\lambda_1}$. Therefore

$$c_{\lambda_1,k} = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{\lambda_1}} \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda_1,k}(\gamma(t)) \leqslant \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{\lambda_2}} \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda_2,k}(\gamma(t)) = c_{\lambda_2,k}. \quad \square$$

**Proof of Theorem 2.1:** Since $I_k(0) = 0$, it follows from Lemma 2.4 and the mountain pass theorem that, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, there exists $\{u_n\} := \{u_n^{(k)}\} \subset \mathscr{D}_k$, $n = 1, 2, \cdots$, such that

$$I_k(u_n) \xrightarrow{n} c_{\lambda,k} \quad \text{and} \quad I_k'(u_n) \xrightarrow{n} 0 \text{ in } \mathscr{D}_k^*,$$

where $\mathscr{D}_k^*$ is the dual space of $\mathscr{D}_k$. Hence, as $n \to +\infty$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^2 + V_\mu(x) u_n^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{B_k} \phi_n u_n^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{B_k} |u_n|^{p+1} dx = c_{\lambda,k} + o(1), \tag{2.11}$$

$$I_k'(u_n)u_n = \int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^2 + V_\mu(x) u_n^2 dx + \lambda \int_{B_k} \phi_n u_n^2 dx - \int_{B_k} |u_n|^{p+1} dx, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\int_{B_k} \nabla u_n \nabla \varphi + V_\mu(x) u_n \varphi dx + \lambda \int_{B_k} \phi_n u_n \varphi dx - \int_{B_k} |u_n|^{p-1} u_n \varphi dx = o(1), \tag{2.13}$$

for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_k$, where $\phi_n$ denotes the unique solution of Poisson equation $-\Delta \phi_n = u_n^2$ in $\mathscr{D}_k$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large, if $\{u_n\} = \{u_n^{(k)}\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_k$, then there exists $u_k \in \mathscr{D}_k$ such that, passing to a subsequence,

$$u_n \overset{n}{\rightharpoonup} u_k \text{ weakly in } \mathscr{D}_k \text{ and strongly in } L^q(B_k) \text{ for } q \in (1,6),$$

since the embedding $\mathscr{D}_k \subset H_0^1(B_k) \hookrightarrow L^q(B_k)$ is compact. Hence, Lemma 2.2 follows that

$$\int_{B_k} \phi_n u_n^2 dx \xrightarrow{n} \int_{B_k} \phi_{u_k} u_k^2 dx, \quad \text{where } -\Delta \phi_{u_k} = u_k^2 \ \text{ in } \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k).$$

Based on these facts, it is not difficult to see that $u_n \xrightarrow{n} u_k$ strongly in $\mathscr{D}_k$ by (2.12) and (2.13). Hence, $I_k(u_k) = c_{\lambda,k} \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$ by Lemma 2.4, and $u_k \not\equiv 0$ is a weak solution of (2.1). Therefore, to prove Theorem 2.1 we need only to show that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_k$.

If $p \in [3,5)$, then $\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p+1} \geqslant 0$. Since $I_k'(u_n) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ in $\mathscr{D}_k^*$, subtracted $\frac{1}{4} \times$ (2.12) from (2.11) which gives

$$\|u_n\|_k^2 \leqslant 8c_k + 2, \quad \text{for } n \text{ large enough}, \tag{2.14}$$

hence $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_k$. However, if $p \in (1,2)$, the properties of $I_k(u)$ change greatly. In this case, we have to use other trick to get the boundedness of $\{u_n\}$ in $\mathscr{D}_k$. By $-\Delta \phi_n = u_n^2$ in $\mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\lambda} \int_{B_k} |u_n|^3 dx = \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{B_k} \nabla \phi_n \nabla |u_n| dx &\leqslant \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{B_k} |\nabla \phi_n|^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{B_k} \phi_n |u_n|^2 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Since $I_k'(u_n) \xrightarrow{n} 0$ in $\mathscr{D}_k^*$, we may assume that $\|I_k'(u_n)\|_{\mathscr{D}_k^*} \leqslant 1$ for $n$ large. Then, by (2.12) and (2.15) we see that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large,

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_{B_k} |\nabla u_n|^2 + V_\mu u_n^2 dx + \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{B_k} |u_n|^3 dx \leqslant \int_{B_k} |u_n|^{p+1} dx + \|u_n\|_k. \tag{2.16}$$

If $p \in (1,2)$ and the Young's inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_k} |u_n|^{p+1} dx &\leqslant \int_{B_k} \left[ \frac{(p+1)\varepsilon}{3} |u_n|^3 + \frac{2-p}{3} \varepsilon^{-\frac{p+1}{2-p}} \right] dx \\ &= \sqrt{\lambda} \int_{B_k} |u_n|^3 dx + \frac{2-p}{3} \left( \frac{3\sqrt{\lambda}}{p+1} \right)^{-\frac{p+1}{2-p}} |B_k|, \text{ by taking } \varepsilon = \frac{3\sqrt{\lambda}}{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This and (2.16) imply that

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u_n\|_k^2 \leqslant \|u_n\|_k + \frac{2-p}{3}\left(\frac{3\sqrt{\lambda}}{p+1}\right)^{-\frac{p+1}{2-p}}|B_k|, \text{ for } n \text{ large.}$$

So, $\{u_n\} = \{u_n^{(k)}\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large. □

## 3 $L^\infty$-norm priori estimates for solutions of problem (2.1)

The aim of this section is to establish priori estimates of $L^\infty$-norm for solutions of (1.1) and (2.1). If $p \in (1,2)$, Lemma 3.1 shows that the $L^\infty$-norm of solutions of (1.1) or (2.1) is bounded above by a constant depending only on $\lambda$ and $p$. If $p \in [3,5)$, similar to (2.14), we know that the solution $u_k$ of (2.1) is uniformly bounded in $\mathscr{D}_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and so does in $L^6(B_k)$, then in Lemma 3.3 we establish an estimate of $|u_k|_{L^\infty(B_k)}$ by using $|u_k|_{L^6(B_k)}$. These priori estimates are important in showing that the solution $u_k$ of (2.1) is uniformly bounded with respect to the domain $B_k$ and in showing that $\tilde{u}_k$, the extension of $u_k$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$, converges to a nontrivial solution of (1.1).

**Lemma 3.1** *For $p \in (1,2)$ and $\Omega = B_k$ or $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, let $(u,\phi) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ be a weak solution of the following problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + V(x)u + \lambda\phi(x)u = |u|^{p-1}u, \ \ x \in \Omega, \\ -\Delta\phi = u^2, \ x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

*where $\lambda > 0$, $V(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $V(x) \geqslant 1$. Then*

$$|u(x)| \leqslant c_p\phi(x) \ \textit{and} \ \ |u(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}, \quad \textit{a.e. in } x \in \Omega,$$

*where $c_p = (p-1)(2-p)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}$ and $C_{p,\lambda} = \frac{1}{2}(2-p)\left(\frac{pc_p}{2\lambda}\right)^{\frac{p}{2-p}}$.*

*Proof:* By assumption, $(u,\phi) \in H_0^1(\Omega) \times \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of (3.1), then, for any $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla v dx + \int_\Omega V(x)uvdx + \lambda\int_\Omega \phi(x)uvdx - \int_\Omega |u|^{p-1}uvdx = 0, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\int_\Omega \nabla\phi\nabla vdx = \int_\Omega u^2vdx. \tag{3.3}$$

Adding $c_p \int_\Omega u^2 v dx$ on both sides of (3.2), and using (3.3) we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \nabla u \nabla v dx + \int_\Omega [V(x)u + c_p u^2 - |u|^{p-1}u] v dx + \lambda \int_\Omega \phi(x) u v dx \\
= c_p \int_\Omega \nabla \phi \nabla v dx, \quad \text{for any } v \in H_0^1(\Omega).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}
$$

Based on this observation, we prove our lemma by the following two cases.

**Cases 1:** $\Omega = B_k$. We let

$$
w_1(x) = (u(x) - c_p \phi(x))^+ \quad \text{and } \Omega_1 = \{x \in \Omega : w_1(x) > 0\}. \tag{3.5}
$$

then $w_1 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u(x)|_{\Omega_1} \geqslant c_p \phi(x) > 0$. Taking $v(x) = w_1(x)$ in (3.4), and using $V(x) \geqslant 1$, we see that

$$
\int_{\Omega_1} \nabla u \nabla w_1 dx + \int_{\Omega_1} [u + c_p u^2 - |u|^{p-1}u] w_1 dx \leqslant c_p \int_{\Omega_1} \nabla \phi \nabla w_1 dx. \tag{3.6}
$$

However, for all $t \geqslant 0$ we have $t + c_p t^2 - t^p \geqslant 0$ if $p \in (1,2)$ and $c_p = (p-1)(2-p)^{\frac{2-p}{p-1}}$. Then, (3.6) implies that $\int_{\Omega_1} \nabla u \nabla w_1 dx - c_p \int_{\Omega_1} \nabla \phi \nabla w_1 dx \leqslant 0$, that is,

$$
\int_{\Omega_1} \nabla (u - c_p \phi) \nabla w_1 dx = \int_{\Omega_1} |\nabla w_1|^2 dx = 0. \tag{3.7}
$$

Hence, $|\Omega_1| = 0$ or $w_1|_{\Omega_1} \equiv$ constant. By the definition of $\Omega_1$ and $w_1 \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_1$, then $u(x) \leqslant c_p \phi(x)$ a.e. in $\Omega$. On the other hand, replacing $u$ by $-u$ and repeating the above procedure, we see that $-u(x) \leqslant c_p \phi(x)$. Therefore

$$
|u(x)| \leqslant c_p \phi(x) \text{ a.e. in } x \in \Omega. \tag{3.8}
$$

To prove that $|u(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}$ a.e. in $x \in \Omega$, we let

$$
w_2(x) = (u(x) - C_{p,\lambda})^+ \quad \text{and } \Omega_2 = \{x \in \Omega : w_2(x) > 0\}, \tag{3.9}
$$

then $w_2 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $u(x)|_{\Omega_2} \geqslant C_{p,\lambda} > 0$. Taking $v(x) = w_2(x)$ in (3.2) and using (3.8) and $V(x) \geqslant 1$, it follows that

$$
\int_{\Omega_2} \nabla u \nabla w_2 + u w_2 dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega_2} |u|^{p-1} u w_2 - \frac{\lambda}{c_p} u^2 w_2 dx \leqslant \int_{\Omega_2} C_{p,\lambda} w_2 dx,
$$

here we used the fact that $\max\limits_{t \geqslant 0} \{t^p - \frac{\lambda}{c_p} t^2\} = C_{p,\lambda}$ if $p \in (1,2)$. This yields

$$
\int_{\Omega_2} |\nabla (u - C_{p,\lambda})^+|^2 + |(u - C_{p,\lambda})^+|^2 dx = \int_{\Omega_2} \nabla [u - C_{p,\lambda}] \nabla w_2 + [u - C_{p,\lambda}] w_2 dx \leqslant 0,
$$

it follows that $|\Omega_2| = 0$, then $u(x) \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}$ a.e in $x \in \Omega$. Similarly, $-u(x) \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}$. Therefore

$$|u(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}, \text{ a.e. in } x \in \Omega. \tag{3.10}$$

**Case 2:** $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$. In this case, it is not sure if $w_1(x)$ given by (3.5) is in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, so we need to replace $w_1(x)$ in (3.5) and the correspondence by

$$w_\epsilon(x) = (u(x) - c_p\phi(x) - \epsilon)^+ \text{ for any } \epsilon > 0.$$

We claim that $w_\epsilon(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. In fact, by the second equation of (3.1) and Theorem 8.17 in [14], we know that

$$|\phi|_{L^\infty(B_1(y))} \leqslant C\left(|\phi|_{L^6(B_2(y))} + |u|^2_{L^6(B_3(y))}\right), \quad \text{for each } y \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

where $C$ is a constant independent of $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$. This and $\phi \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ imply that $\phi(x) \overset{|x|\to+\infty}{\to} 0$. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, taking $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(B_3(y))$, it follows from (3.1) that

$$\int_{B_3(y)} \nabla u \nabla \varphi + b(x)u\varphi dx = \int_{B_3(y)} c(x)\varphi dx,$$

where $b(x) = V(x) + \lambda\phi(x)$ and $c(x) = |u|^{p-1}u(x)$. Clearly, $c(x) \in L^{\frac{6}{p}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $b(x) \in L^\infty(B^c_{R_1})$ for $R_1 > 0$ large enough since $\phi(x) \overset{|x|\to+\infty}{\to} 0$. For each $|y| > R_1 + 3$, since $p < 2$ and $\frac{6}{p} > \frac{3}{2}$, Theorem 8.17 in [14] implies that

$$|u|_{L^\infty(B_1(y))} \leqslant C\left(|u|_{L^2(B_2(y))} + |c(x)|_{L^{\frac{6}{p}}(B_3(y))}\right),$$

where $C > 0$ depends only on $p$ and $|b(x)|_{L^\infty(B^c_{R_1})}$. This implies that

$$u(x) \to 0 \text{ as } |x| \to \infty. \tag{3.11}$$

Hence, there is $R_\epsilon > 0$ such that $\text{supp} w_\epsilon \subset B_{R_\epsilon}$, $w_\epsilon(x) \in H_0^1(B_{R_\epsilon})$ and $w_\epsilon(x) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Noting that $\nabla(u - c_p\phi) = \nabla(u - c_p\phi - \epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, we see that (3.7) holds for $w_\epsilon$, then Poincare inequality implies that $\int_{\Omega_1} |w_\epsilon|^2 dx \le C_\epsilon \int_{\Omega_1} |\nabla w_\epsilon|^2 dx = 0$ since $w_\epsilon(x) \in H_0^1(B_{R_\epsilon})$ and $w_\epsilon(x) \equiv 0$ on $B_{R_\epsilon} \setminus \Omega_1$. So, $u(x) \leqslant c_p\phi(x) + \epsilon$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and (3.8) is obtained by letting $\epsilon \to 0$. By (3.11), there is $R_0 > 0$ such that $\text{supp}(u(x) - C_{p,\lambda})^+ \subset B_{R_0}$ and $w_2(x)$ given by (3.9) is in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then exactly the same as in Case 1 we get (3.10). $\square$

To get the $L^\infty$-norm estimate of solutions to problem (2.1) for $p \in [3, 5)$, we need the following general $L^\infty$-norm estimate for functions in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by using its $L^{2^*}$ norm, where $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$.

**Lemma 3.2** *Let $N \geqslant 3$, $p \in (1, \frac{N+2}{N-2})$ and let $u \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus \{0\}$ be a nonnegative function such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla u \nabla (h(u)\varphi) dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p-1} u h(u) \varphi dx, \tag{3.12}$$

*holds for any nonnegative $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and any nonnegative piecewise smooth function $h$ on $[0, +\infty)$ with $h(0) = 0$ and $h' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Then, $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and there exist $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$, which depend only on $N$ and $p$, such that*

$$|u|_\infty \leqslant C_1 \left(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{C_2}\right) |u|_{2^*}.$$

*Proof:* The main idea of the proof is Moser iterations, which is somehow standard. For the sake of completeness, we give a proof in the appendix based on [19] and [13]. □

**Lemma 3.3** *For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large, let $p \in [3, 5)$ and $u_k$ be a solution of problem (2.1) given by Theorem 2.1. Then there exist constants $M_0(\lambda) > 0$ and $M(\lambda) > 0$, independent of $k$ and $\mu$, such that*

$$|u_k(x)| \leqslant M_0(\lambda) \text{ a.e. in } x \in B_k \quad \text{and} \quad \|u_k\|_k + |\nabla \phi_k|_{L^2(B_k)} \leqslant M(\lambda).$$

*Moreover, $M_0(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ are non-decreasing in $\lambda > 0$.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.1, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large, saying $k > k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $u_k$ and $c_\lambda > 0$ such that

$$I_k(u_k) = c_{\lambda,k} \leqslant c_\lambda \text{ and } I_k'(u_k) = 0 \text{ in } \mathscr{D}_k^*. \tag{3.13}$$

Similar to the derivation of (2.14), we have

$$|\nabla u_k|_{L^2(B_k)} \leqslant \|u_k\|_k \leqslant 2\sqrt{c_{\lambda,k}}, \tag{3.14}$$

this and (2.4) yield

$$|\nabla \phi_k|^2_{L^2(B_k)} \leqslant C|u_k|^4_{L^{\frac{12}{5}}(B_k)} \leqslant C\|u_k\|_k^4 \leqslant 16Cc^2_{\lambda,k}, \tag{3.15}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $k$, $\lambda$ and $\mu$. Let $M(\lambda) = \sup\limits_{k>k_0,\mu>0} \{2\sqrt{c_{\lambda,k}} + 4\sqrt{C}c_{\lambda,k}\}$, then $M(\lambda)$ is finite for each $\lambda > 0$ since $c_{k,\lambda} \leqslant c_\lambda$. Moreover, $M(\lambda)$ is non-decreasing in $\lambda$ since $c_{\lambda,k}$ is non-decreasing in $\lambda$ by Theorem

2.1. Hence (3.14) and (3.15) imply that $\|u_k\|_k + |\nabla\phi_k|_{L^2(B_k)} \leqslant M(\lambda)$. Define $\tilde{u}_k$ as in (1.8), then $\tilde{u}_k \in \mathscr{D}_V$ and $\mathrm{supp}\tilde{u}_k \subseteq \bar{B}_k$, hence (3.14) yields

$$\|\tilde{u}_k\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} \leqslant 2\sqrt{c_{\lambda,k}}. \tag{3.16}$$

For any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and any nonnegative piecewise smooth function $h$ with $h' \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $h(0) = 0$, let $v = h(\tilde{u}_k^+)\varphi$, then $v \in \mathscr{D}_k$ and $I_k'(u_k)v = 0$, this yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla\tilde{u}_k^+\nabla v + V_\mu(x)\tilde{u}_k^+ v dx + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k\tilde{u}_k^+ v dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}_k^+|^{p-1}\tilde{u}_k^+ v dx.$$

Since $\tilde{\phi}_k$, $V_\mu$ and $\tilde{u}_k^+$ are nonnegative, this implies that (3.12) holds for $u = \tilde{u}_k^+$ and $N = 3$. Then, by Lemma 3.2 and (3.16) there exist $\bar{C}_1 > 0$ and $\bar{C}_2 > 0$, depend only on $p$, such that

$$|\tilde{u}_k^+|_\infty \leqslant C_1(1 + |\tilde{u}_k^+|_{2^*}^{C_2})|\tilde{u}_k^+|_{2^*} \leqslant \sup_{k>k_0,\mu>0}\{\bar{C}_1(1 + c_{\lambda,k}^{\bar{C}_2})\sqrt{c_{\lambda,k}}\} := M_0(\lambda).$$

Similarly, we know that $|\tilde{u}_k^-|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda)$. So, $|u_k|_{L^\infty(B_k)} \leq |\tilde{u}_k|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda)$. Moreover, $M_0(\lambda)$ is nondecreasing in $\lambda > 0$ since $c_{\lambda,k}$ is nondecreasing in $\lambda$.
□

# 4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

For $r > 0$, let $\xi_r \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\xi_r(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| > \frac{r}{2}, \\ 0, & |x| < \frac{r}{4}, \end{cases} \quad \text{with } |\nabla\xi_r| \leqslant \frac{8}{r}. \tag{4.1}$$

To prove our Theorems, we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *Assume* (G$_1$) (G$_3$) *hold. Let* $p \in (1,2)$, $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ *and* $\phi \in L^6(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *be such that* $|u|_\infty \leqslant L$ *and* $|u(x)| \leqslant K\phi(x)$ *a.e. in* $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, *for some* $L > 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Moreover, for all* $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *with* $\eta \geqslant 0$, *there holds*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u\nabla(u\eta) + V_\mu(x)u^2\eta dx + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2\eta dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p+1}\eta dx, \tag{4.2}$$

*where* $\lambda > 0$. *Then, if* $\mu > \bar{\mu} = \max\{0, L^{p-1} - 1\}$, *there exists* $M_\mu > 0$ *(depends on* $L, K, p, \lambda, \mu$*) which is decreasing in* $\mu > \bar{\mu}$ *such that*

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant M_\mu.$$

*Proof:* For $\xi_r$ given by (4.1), taking $\eta = \xi_r$ in (4.2), it gives that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + V_\mu(x)u^2)\xi_r dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 \xi_r dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p+1}\xi_r dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u\nabla u \nabla \xi_r dx,$$

then, by $|u|_\infty \leqslant L$ and (4.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + (1+\mu g(x))u^2)\xi_r dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 \xi_r dx \\ &\leqslant L^{p-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u^2 \xi_r dx + \frac{8}{r}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2)dx,\end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + [1+\mu g(x) - L^{p-1}]u^2)\xi_r dx \leqslant \frac{8}{r}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2)dx. \tag{4.3}$$

Since $\mu > \bar{\mu} \geq L^{p-1} - 1$, for each $\tau \in (\bar{\mu}, \mu)$, there exists $\epsilon_\tau > 0$ such that $\tau(1-\epsilon_\tau) > L^{p-1} - 1$. By (G$_3$) we can find $R_\tau > 0$ such that $g(x) \geqslant 1 - \epsilon_\tau$ for all $|x| \geqslant R_\tau$, then $1 + \mu g(x) > 1 + \tau(1-\epsilon_\tau) > L^{p-1}$ for all $|x| \geq R_\tau$ and there is $\delta_\tau > 0$ such that $1 + \mu g(x) > L^{p-1} + \delta_\tau$ for all $|x| \geqslant R_\tau$. So, if $\mu > \bar{\mu}$ and $r/4 > R_\tau$, it follows from (4.3) that, for each $\tau \in (\bar{\mu}, \mu)$,

$$\int_{|x|>\frac{r}{2}} (|\nabla u|^2 + \delta_\tau u^2)dx \leqslant \frac{8}{r}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2)dx. \tag{4.4}$$

On the other hand, taking $\eta \equiv 1$ in (4.2), it gives

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + (1+\mu g(x))u^2 dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} L^{p-1}u^2 - \frac{\lambda}{K}|u|^3 dx. \tag{4.5}$$

Let $\beta(t) = L^{p-1}t^2 - \frac{\lambda}{K}t^3 (t \geqslant 0)$, then there exists $C^* := C(L, K, p, \lambda) \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $\beta(t) \leqslant C^* < +\infty$ for all $t \geqslant 0$. Therefore, if $r > 4R_\tau$ and $\mu > \bar{\mu}$, it follows from (4.4) and (4.5) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + (1+\mu g(x))u^2 dx \leqslant \int_{|x|<\frac{r}{2}} \beta(u)dx + \int_{|x|\geqslant\frac{r}{2}} \beta(u)dx \\ &\leqslant \int_{|x|<\frac{r}{2}} C^* dx + L^{p-1}\int_{|x|\geqslant\frac{r}{2}} u^2 dx \leqslant C^*|B_{\frac{r}{2}}(0)| + L^{p-1}\frac{8}{r\delta_\tau}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2)dx.\end{aligned}$$

Take $r_\tau > 4R_\tau$ large enough such that $L^{p-1}\frac{8}{r_\tau \delta_\tau} < \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + (1+\mu g(x))u^2 dx \leqslant 2C^*|B_{\frac{r_\tau}{2}}|.$$

By Sobolev embedding, $|u|_{p+1}$ is also bounded above by a constant depending on $C^*$ and $\tau$. This and (4.2) imply that there exists $M_\tau := M(L, K, p, \lambda, \tau)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant M_\tau, \text{ for each } \tau \in (\bar{\mu}, \mu).$$

Let $M_\mu = \inf_{\tau \in (\bar{\mu}, \mu)} M_\tau$, then $M_\mu$ is decreasing in $\mu > \bar{\mu}$ and depends only on $L, K, p, \lambda, \mu$ such that

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant M_\mu. \qquad \Box$$

**Lemma 4.2** *If* $p > 1$, *and* $(\mathrm{G}_1)$ $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ *hold, let* $\{u_k\}$ *be bounded in* $\mathscr{D}_V$ *such that* $|u_k|_\infty \leqslant \bar{M}$ *(for some* $\bar{M} > 0$*) and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_k \nabla (u_k \eta) + V_\mu(x) u_k^2 \eta dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_k|^{p+1} \eta dx, \tag{4.6}$$

*for all* $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *with* $\eta \geqslant 0$. *Then, for each* $\mu > \max\{0, \bar{M}^{p-1} - 1\}$, *there exists* $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ *such that, passing to a subsequence,*

$$|u_k - u|_q \xrightarrow{k} 0 \quad \textit{for} \quad q \in [2, 6). \tag{4.7}$$

*Proof:* Since $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_V$, there exists $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that, passing to a subsequence,

$$u_k \overset{k}{\rightharpoonup} u \text{ weakly in } \mathscr{D}_V, \quad u_k(x) \xrightarrow{k} u(x) \text{ a.e. in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{4.8}$$

For $\xi_r$ given by (4.1), taking $\eta = \xi_r$ in (4.6),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_k \nabla (u_k \xi_r) + V_\mu(x) u_k^2 \xi_r dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_k|^{p+1} \xi_r dx.$$

Since $\mu > \max\{0, \bar{M}^{p-1} - 1\}$, $|u_k|_\infty \leqslant \bar{M}$ and $(\mathrm{G}_3)$ holds, similar to the discussion of (4.4), there exists $R_\mu > 0$ and $\delta_\mu > 0$ such that, for all $R \geqslant 4R_\mu$, we have

$$\int_{|x|>R} (|\nabla u_k|^2 + \delta_\mu u_k^2) dx < \frac{T}{R} \quad \text{uniformly for } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ large}, \tag{4.9}$$

where $T = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \|u_k\|_{\mathscr{D}_V}$. Since $H^1(B_R) \hookrightarrow L^q(B_R)$ is compact for $1 \leqslant q < 6$, passing to a subsequence, (4.8) implies that

$$u_k(x) \xrightarrow{k} u(x) \ \text{ in } L^q(B_R) \text{ for } 1 \leqslant q < 6. \tag{4.10}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large and any $R > 4R_\mu$ large enough, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_k - u|_q &\leqslant |u_k - u|_{L^q(B_R)} + |u_k - u|_{L^q(B_R^c)} \\
&\leqslant |u_k - u|_{L^q(B_R)} + |u_k - u|_{L^2(B_R^c)}^{\frac{6-q}{2}} |u_k - u|_{L^6(B_R^c)}^{\frac{3q-6}{2}} \\
&\leqslant |u_k - u|_{L^q(B_R)} + C\|u_k - u\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}^{\frac{3q-6}{2}} \left( |u|_{L^2(B_R^c)}^{\frac{6-q}{2}} + |u_k|_{L^2(B_R^c)}^{\frac{6-q}{2}} \right) \\
&\leqslant |u_k - u|_{L^q(B_R)} + C\left( |u|_{L^2(B_R^c)}^{\frac{6-q}{2}} + (T/R)^{\frac{6-q}{2}} \right) \text{ by (4.9).}
\end{aligned}$$

By letting $k \to +\infty$, then $R \to +\infty$, we get (4.7). $\square$

**Lemma 4.3** *Assume $p \in (1, 5)$. If* (G$_1$) (G$_3$) *hold and $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $\mathscr{D}_V$ satisfying*

$$|u_k|_\infty \leqslant \bar{M}, \quad \text{for some } \bar{M} > 0.$$

*Let $\phi_k$ be the solution of $-\Delta\phi = u_k^2$ in $\mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ and $\tilde{\phi}_k$ be the extension of $\phi_k$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ defined as (1.8) such that, for all $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\eta \geqslant 0$,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_k \nabla(u_k\eta) + V_\mu(x)u_k^2\eta dx + \lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k u_k^2 \eta dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_k|^{p+1}\eta dx, \tag{4.11}$$

*where $\lambda > 0$. Then, for each $\mu > \max\{0, \bar{M}^{p-1} - 1\}$, there exists $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that, passing to a subsequence,*

$$\|u_k - u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} \xrightarrow{k} 0 \text{ and } |\nabla(\tilde{\phi}_k - \phi)|_2 \xrightarrow{k} 0 \text{ with } \phi = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{u^2(y)}{|x-y|}dy. \tag{4.12}$$

*Proof:* Since $\lambda > 0$ and $\tilde{\phi}_k \geqslant 0$, (4.11) implies (4.6), for each $\mu > \max\{0, \bar{M}^{p-1} - 1\}$ applying Lemma 4.2 we have $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that,

$$|u_k - u|_q \xrightarrow{k} 0 \ \text{ for } \ q \in [2, 6), \tag{4.13}$$

This and Lemma 2.3 imply that, passing to a subsequence,

$$\tilde{\phi}_k \xrightarrow{k} \phi = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \frac{u^2(y)}{|x-y|}dy \ \text{ strongly in } \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3).$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k u_k^2 dx \xrightarrow{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi u^2 dx. \tag{4.14}$$

Then (4.12) follows from (4.13), (4.14) and (4.11) with $\eta \equiv 1$. □

Now, we are ready to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. For $u_k \in \mathscr{D}_k$, $\phi_k \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ and $\alpha > 0$, $c_\lambda > 0$ given by Theorem 2.1, let $\tilde{u}_k \in \mathscr{D}_V$ and $\tilde{\phi}_k \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be the extensions of $u_k$ and $\phi_k$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ defined as (1.8) respectively. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \tilde{u}_k|^2 + V_\mu(x)\tilde{u}_k^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k(x)\tilde{u}_k^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}_k|^{p+1} dx = c_{\lambda,k}, \tag{4.15}$$

and $c_{\lambda,k} \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$. Moreover, for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V$ with $\text{supp}\varphi \subseteq \bar{B}_k$, by $I_k'(u_k) = 0$ we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \tilde{u}_k \nabla \varphi + V_\mu(x)\tilde{u}_k \varphi dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k \tilde{u}_k \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}_k|^{p-1}\tilde{u}_k \varphi dx. \tag{4.16}$$

Note that for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $\text{supp}\varphi \subset \bar{B}_k$ as $k \to +\infty$, therefore,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla \tilde{u}_k \nabla \varphi + V_\mu(x)\tilde{u}_k \varphi dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k \tilde{u}_k \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\tilde{u}_k|^{p-1}\tilde{u}_k \varphi dx + o(1). \tag{4.17}$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.1:** Let $\lambda_*$ be given by Theorem 2.1, and $\lambda_* < +\infty$ if $p \in (1, 2)$. For $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$, let $(u_k, \phi_k) \in \mathscr{D}_k \times \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_k)$ be a solution of (2.1) for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ large. Applying Lemma 3.1 with $\Omega = B_k$, there exist $c_p > 0$ and $C_{p,\lambda} > 0$ such that

$$|u_k(x)| \leqslant c_p \phi_k(x) \text{ and } |u_k(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}, \quad \text{a.e. in } x \in B_k.$$

Then,

$$|\tilde{u}_k(x)| \leqslant c_p \tilde{\phi}_k(x) \text{ and } |\tilde{u}_k(x)| \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}, \quad \text{a.e. in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Since $\tilde{u}_k \eta \in \mathscr{D}_k$ for any $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, it follows from $I_k'(u_k) = 0$ that (4.2) holds for $u = \tilde{u}_k$ and $\phi = \tilde{\phi}_k$, applying Lemma 4.1 with $L = C_{p,\lambda}$, $K = c_p$ and $u = \tilde{u}_k$, there is $M_\mu := M(p, \lambda, \mu) > 0$, which is decreasing in $\mu > \mu_1$, such that

$$\|\tilde{u}_k\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \tilde{\phi}_k|_2 = \|\tilde{u}_k\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + \left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \tilde{\phi}_k \tilde{u}_k^2 dx\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant M_\mu.$$

Similarly, $\{\tilde{u}_k\}$ and $\{\tilde{\phi}_k\}$ satisfy (4.11) by $I_k'(u_k) = 0$. Hence, Lemma 4.3 shows that there exists $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that, passing to a subsequence

$$\tilde{u}_k \xrightarrow{k} u \text{ strongly in } \mathscr{D}_V \text{ and } \tilde{\phi}_k \xrightarrow{k} \phi_u \text{ strongly in } \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{4.18}$$

Furthermore,

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \phi_u|_2 \leqslant M_\mu \text{ and } |u|_\infty \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}. \tag{4.19}$$

Combining (4.15) and (4.18), we have $I(u) \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$. On the other hand, by (4.17), for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, as $k \to +\infty$, $I'(\tilde{u}_k)\varphi = o(1)$, then, using (4.18) we see that $I'(u)\varphi = 0$. So, $u$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.1) in $\mathscr{D}_V$. By the second equation of (1.1) and Theorem 8.17 in [14], for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we have

$$\sup_{B_1(y)} \phi_u \leqslant C(|\phi_u|_{L^6(B_2(y))} + |u|^2_{L^6(B_4(y))}),$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant independent of $u$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$. This and (4.19) show that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u(x) \leqslant C M_\mu (1 + M_\mu) \triangleq C(p, \lambda, \mu) =: C_\mu, \tag{4.20}$$

where $C_\mu > 0$ is a constant dependents only on $p, \lambda, \mu$. $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.2:** For $p \in [3, 5)$ and $\lambda > 0$, let $(u_k, \phi_k) \in \mathscr{D}_k \times \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(B_k)$ be a solution given by Theorem 2.1. By Lemma 3.3, we know that

$$|u_k|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda), \quad \|u_k\|_k + |\nabla \phi_k|_{L^2(B_k)} \leqslant M(\lambda),$$

where $M_0(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ are given by Lemma 3.3. Hence,

$$|\tilde{u}_k|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda), \quad \|\tilde{u}_k\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \tilde{\phi}_k|_2 \leqslant M(\lambda).$$

Applying Lemma 4.3 with $u_k = \tilde{u}_k$, there exists $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that,

$$\tilde{u}_k \xrightarrow{k} u \text{ in } \mathscr{D}_V. \tag{4.21}$$

Moreover,

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \phi_u|_2 \leqslant M(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad |u|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda). \tag{4.22}$$

Hence, (4.21) and (4.15) show that $I(u) \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$, where $\alpha$ and $c_\lambda$ are constants given by Theorem 2.1. On the other hand, by (4.17), for any $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, as $k \to +\infty$, $I'(\tilde{u}_k)\varphi = o(1)$, and it follows from (4.21) that

$I'(u)\varphi = 0$. So, $u$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.1) in $\mathscr{D}_V$. Noting (4.22), similar to the discussion of (4.20), we have

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u(x) \leqslant CM(\lambda)(1+M(\lambda)) =: M_1(\lambda),$$

where $M_1(\lambda)$ is a constant and independent of $\mu$. By Lemma 3.3, $M(\lambda)$ is non-decreasing in $\lambda > 0$, hence $M_1(\lambda)$ is also non-decreasing in $\lambda$. $\square$

## 5 Proofs of Theorems 1.3 to 1.5

**Proof of Theorem 1.3:** By Theorem 1.2, if $\mu > \mu_2(\lambda)$, problem (1.1) has always a solution $u_\lambda \in \mathscr{D}_V$ for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla\phi_{u_\lambda}|_2 \leqslant M(\lambda) \leqslant M(1) \quad \text{and} \quad |u_\lambda|_\infty \leqslant M_0(\lambda) \leqslant M_0(1),$$

since $M_0(\lambda)$ and $M(\lambda)$ are nondecreasing in $\lambda > 0$. Then, there exists $u_0 \in \mathscr{D}_V$, passing to a subsequence, such that

$$u_\lambda \overset{\lambda\to 0}{\rightharpoonup} u_0 \text{ weakly in } \mathscr{D}_V \text{ and } u_\lambda \overset{\lambda\to 0}{\to} u_0, \text{ a.e. in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{5.1}$$

For any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\lambda} u_\lambda \varphi dx \leqslant |\phi_{u_\lambda}|_6 |u_\lambda|_{\frac{12}{5}} |\varphi|_{\frac{12}{5}} \leqslant C(M(1))$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_\lambda \nabla\varphi + V_\mu(x) u_\lambda \varphi dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\lambda} u_\lambda \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\lambda|^{p-1} u_\lambda \varphi dx, \tag{5.2}$$

let $\lambda \to 0$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_0 \nabla\varphi + V_\mu(x) u_0 \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_0|^{p-1} u_0 \varphi dx, \tag{5.3}$$

that is, $u_0$ is a weak solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = 0$. Since $u_\lambda \eta \in \mathscr{D}_V$ for any $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\eta \geqslant 0$, by (5.2) and $\lambda > 0$, we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_\lambda \nabla(u_\lambda \eta) + V_\mu(x) u_\lambda^2 \eta dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\lambda|^{p+1} \eta dx.$$

By Lemma 4.2, there is $u^* \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that $u_\lambda \overset{\lambda\to 0}{\to} u^*$ in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $q \in [2,6)$. Hence $u^* = u_0$ by (5.1). Let $\varphi = u_\lambda$ in (5.2) and $\varphi = u_0$ in (5.3), since $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\lambda} u_\lambda^2 dx = |\nabla\phi_{u_\lambda}|_2^2 \leqslant M^2(1)$, as $\lambda \to 0$, we have $u_\lambda \to u_0$ in $\mathscr{D}_V$. This and $I(u_\lambda) \in [\alpha, c_\lambda]$ for $\lambda > 0$ imply that $I_0(u_0) \geqslant \alpha > 0$, hence $u_0 \not\equiv 0$. $\square$
**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** To make it clear that $\mathscr{D}_V$ depends on $\mu$, here

we denote $\mathscr{D}_V$ by $\mathscr{D}_\mu$. Let $\mu_0 > \max\{C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 1, M_0^{p-1} - 1\}$ and $\mu_0 > 0$ by Remark 1.1. For $\mu \geqslant \mu_0$, let $u_\mu$ be the solution given by Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2, then $\{u_\mu\}$ is bounded in $D_{\mu_0}$ since $M_\mu \leq M_{\mu_0}$. For some $\bar{u} \in \mathscr{D}_{\mu_0} \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ we may assume that

$$u_\mu \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \text{ weakly in } \mathscr{D}_{\mu_0} \text{ and } u_\mu \to \bar{u} \textit{ a.e.} \text{ in } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \text{ as } \mu \to +\infty. \tag{5.4}$$

Then, Fatou's lemma shows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(x)\bar{u}^2 dx \leqslant \lim_{\mu\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} g(x)u_\mu^2 dx \leqslant \lim_{\mu\to+\infty} \frac{1}{\mu}\|u_\mu\|_{\mathscr{D}_\mu}^2 \leqslant \lim_{\mu\to+\infty} \frac{M_{\mu_0}^2}{\mu} = 0,$$

so (G$_1$) and (G$_2$) means that $\bar{u}(x) = 0$ a.e. in $x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_0$. On the other hand, for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_\mu$, by $I'(u_\mu) = 0$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_\mu \nabla\varphi + (1 + \mu g(x))u_\mu\varphi dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu \varphi dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\mu|^{p-1} u_\mu \varphi dx. \tag{5.5}$$

For each $\mu \geqslant \mu_0$ and $\eta \in C_B^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\eta \geqslant 0$, it follows from (5.5) and (G$_1$) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_\mu \nabla(u_\mu\eta) + (1 + \mu_0 g(x))u_\mu^2 \eta dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\mu|^{p+1}\eta dx.$$

Then, it follows from (5.4), Theorem 1.1 or 1.2 and Lemma 4.2 with $\mathscr{D}_V = \mathscr{D}_{\mu_0}$ and $\{u_k\} = \{u_\mu\}$ that

$$|u_\mu - \bar{u}|_q \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\to} 0 \text{ for } q \in [2, 6), \tag{5.6}$$

hence, Lemma 2.2 yields that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu^2(x) dx \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\to} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{\bar{u}} \bar{u}^2(x) dx. \tag{5.7}$$

Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$, by (5.4) and (5.7) (see (3.18) in [15] for the details), we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu(x)\varphi(x) dx \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\to} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{\bar{u}} \bar{u}(x)\varphi(x) dx, \tag{5.8}$$

and (5.8) holds also for $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ by the density of $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Let $\varphi = \bar{u}$ in (5.5) and in (5.8), then, by (5.4) and (5.6) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla\bar{u}|^2 + \bar{u}^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{\bar{u}} \bar{u}^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}|^{p+1} dx. \tag{5.9}$$

By (5.6) and (5.5) with $\varphi = u_\mu$, we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_\mu|^2 + u_\mu^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu^2(x) dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_\mu|^{p+1} dx \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\to} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\bar{u}|^{p+1} dx. \tag{5.10}$$

It follows from (5.9) and (5.10) that

$$\lim_{\mu\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_\mu|^2 + u_\mu^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu^2 dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 + \bar{u}^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{\bar{u}} \bar{u}^2 dx,$$

this and (5.7) show that

$$\lim_{\mu\to+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_\mu|^2 + u_\mu^2 dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla \bar{u}|^2 + \bar{u}^2 dx,$$

and the lower semi-continuity of norm implies that

$$u_\mu \to \bar{u}, \quad \text{in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \ \text{ as } \mu \to +\infty. \tag{5.11}$$

Now, we claim that $\bar{u}(x) \not\equiv 0$ on $\Omega_0$. Otherwise, $\bar{u} = 0$ a.e. in $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then $|u_\mu|_{p+1} \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ and $\int \phi_{u_\mu} u_\mu^2 dx \overset{\mu\to+\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$ by (5.7), hence $I(u_\mu) \to 0$ as $\mu \to +\infty$, which contradicts the fact that $I(u_\mu) \geqslant \alpha > 0$. Since $\partial\Omega_0$ is Lipschitz continuous, we have $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$ by $\bar{u}(x) = 0$, a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \Omega_0$. It follows from (5.11), (5.8) and (5.5) that, for any $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega_0)$,

$$\int_{\Omega_0} \nabla \bar{u} \nabla \varphi + \bar{u}\varphi dx + \frac{\lambda}{4\pi} \int_{\Omega_0\times\Omega_0} \frac{\bar{u}^2(y)\bar{u}(x)\varphi(x)}{|x-y|} dy dx = \int_{\Omega_0} |\bar{u}|^{p-1} \bar{u} \varphi dx,$$

that is $\bar{u}$ is a weak solution of (1.12). □

**Proof of Theorem 1.5:** This proof is motivated by that of Theorem 1.3 in [5]. Let $\mu_0 = \max\{3(M_0^{p-1} - 1), 3(C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 1)\}$. By Theorem 1.1 or 1.2, the $L^\infty$-norms of $u_\mu$ and $\phi_{u_\mu}$ are bounded uniformly in $\mu \geqslant \mu_0$. By (G$_3$), there exists $R_0 > 0$ such that $g(x) > \frac{5}{6}$ for $|x| \geqslant R_0$. Then, we have

$$(-\Delta + \mu) u_\mu^2 = -2(W_\mu - \frac{\mu}{2}) u_\mu^2 - 2|\nabla u_\mu|^2 \leqslant 0 \text{ for } |x| > R_0 \text{ and } \mu > \mu_0, \tag{5.12}$$

where $W_\mu(x) = 1 + \mu g(x) + \lambda \phi_{u_\mu}(x) - |u_\mu(x)|^{p-1}$. On the other hand, let $w_\mu$ be the fundamental solution of $-\Delta + \mu$, then, it follows from Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 4.2 in [8] that $w_\mu$ is $C^\infty$ outside the origin and it is positive such that

$$(-\Delta + \mu) w_\mu = 0 \text{ for } |x| > R_0 \ \text{ and} \tag{5.13}$$

$$w_\mu = |x|^{\frac{-(N-1)}{2}} e^{-\sqrt{\mu}|x|}(1 + o(1)) \text{ as } |x| \to +\infty, \text{ uniformly in } \mu \geqslant \mu_0. \tag{5.14}$$

Let $C_0 = \max\{M_0, C_{p,\lambda}\}$, $\tilde{A} \geqslant \frac{C_0^2}{w_\mu(R_0)}$ and $v(x) = u_\mu^2(x) - \tilde{A} w_\mu$. For $\mu > \mu_0$, it follows from (5.12) and (5.13) that

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta + \mu)v \leqslant 0, & |x| > R_0, \\ v \leqslant 0, & |x| = R_0. \end{cases}$$

The maximum principle (Theorem 8.1 in [14]) implies that

$$u_\mu^2(x) \leqslant \tilde{A} w_\mu(x) \ \text{ for } |x| > R_0.$$

By (5.14), there exists $A > 0$ independent of $\mu > \mu_0$ such that

$$u_\mu(x) \leqslant A|x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{2}(|x|-R_0)} \ \text{ for } |x| > R_0 \text{ and } \mu > \mu_0. \quad \square$$

# 6 Ground state of (1.1) for $p \in (1, 2)$

**Proposition 6.1** *Let* $\mathscr{N} = \{u \in \mathscr{D}_V \setminus \{0\} : I'(u) = 0$ *in* $\mathscr{D}_V^*\}$ *and* $\lambda_*$ *be given by Theorem 1.1,* $C_{p,\lambda}$ *be given by Lemma 3.1. Then, for each* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_*)$ *and* $\mu > C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 1$,

- (**i**) $\mathscr{N} \neq \emptyset$, *and there exists* $C_p > 0$ *such that* $\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} \geqslant C_p$ *for all* $u \in \mathscr{N}$.
- (**ii**) *There exists* $C_{\lambda,\mu} > 0$ *such that* $\sup\limits_{u \in \mathscr{N}} (\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \phi_u|_2) \leqslant C_{\lambda,\mu}$.
- (**iii**) $\mathscr{N} \subset \mathscr{D}_V$ *is a compact set.*

*Proof.* (**i**). Since $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^*)$ and $\mu > C_{p,\lambda}^{p-1} - 1$, Theorem 1.1 implies that $\mathscr{N} \neq \emptyset$. If $u \in \mathscr{N}$, then $I'(u) = 0$ and $u \not\equiv 0$, that is,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 + V_\mu u^2 dx + \lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u u^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p+1} dx.$$

Hence, $\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V}^2 \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p+1} dx \leqslant S^{p+1} \|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V}^{p+1}$ and $\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} \geqslant S^{-\frac{p+1}{p-1}} := C_p$.
(**ii**). Since $\|\cdot\|_{\mathscr{D}_V}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ are equivalent norms in $\mathscr{D}_V$, by Lemma 3.1 with $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, we have that $\sup\limits_{u \in \mathscr{N}} |u|_\infty \leqslant C_{p,\lambda}$ and $|u(x)| \leqslant c_p \phi_u(x)$ a.e. in $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. For $u \in \mathscr{N}$, $I'(u) = 0$ and (4.2) holds. Then Lemma 4.1 implies that

$$\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + |\nabla \phi_u|_2 = \|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} + \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u u^2 dx \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} < C_{\lambda,\mu}, \text{ for some } C_{\lambda,\mu} > 0.$$

(**iii**). Let $\{u_n\} \subset \mathscr{N}$, then $I'(u_n) = 0$ and (4.6) holds for $u_n$. By part (**ii**) and Lemma 4.2, there exists $u \in \mathscr{D}_V$ such that $u_n \xrightarrow{n} u$ strongly in $L^q(\mathbb{R}^3)$. This and Lemma 2.2 show that $\phi_{u_n} \xrightarrow{n} \phi_u$ strongly in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Thus, for any $\varphi \in \mathscr{D}_V$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u_n \nabla \varphi + V_\mu u_n \varphi dx \xrightarrow{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \nabla u \nabla \varphi + V_\mu u \varphi dx,$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_{u_n} u_n \varphi dx \xrightarrow{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \phi_u u \varphi dx \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_n|^{p-1} u_n \varphi dx \xrightarrow{n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^{p-1} u \varphi dx.$$

It follows from $I'(u_n) = 0$ that $I'(u) = 0$ in $\mathscr{D}_V^*$. Then, using $I'(u_n)u_n = I'(u)u$ we know that $u_n \xrightarrow{n} u$ strongly in $\mathscr{D}_V$, this and (**i**) show that $\|u\|_{\mathscr{D}_V} \geqslant C_p$, hence $u \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\mathscr{N}$ is a compact set in $\mathscr{D}_V$. □

**Proof of Theorem 1.6.** By Proposition 6.1 (**iii**), we know that $I$ is bounded below in $\mathscr{N}$ and $c_0 \triangleq \inf\limits_{u \in \mathscr{N}} I(u) > -\infty$, then there exists $\{u_n\} \subset \mathscr{N}$ such that $I(u_n) \xrightarrow{n} c_0$. So, Proposition 6.1 (**ii**), (**iii**) imply that, there exists $u_0 \in \mathscr{N}$ such that $I(u_0) = c_0$ and $I'(u_0) = 0$, that is, $u_0$ is a ground state of (1.1). □

# 7 Appendix

**Proof of Lemma 3.2:** For $\beta > 1,\ M > 1$, the same as [19], we define a function $H \in C^1(0, +\infty)$ by

$$H(s) = \begin{cases} s^\beta, & s \in [0, M], \\ \beta M^{\beta-1} s - (\beta - 1) M^\beta, & s \in (M, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Let

$$G(s) \triangleq \int_0^s |H'(t)|^2 dt = \begin{cases} \frac{\beta^2}{2\beta-1} s^{2\beta-1}, & s \in (0, M], \\ \beta^2 M^{2(\beta-1)} s - \frac{2\beta^2(\beta-1)}{2\beta-1} M^{2\beta-1}, & s \in (M, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then $G(s)$ and $H(s)$ are Lipschitz in $[0, +\infty)$, therefore, $G(u)$ and $H(u)$ are in $\mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if $u \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover,

$$sG(s) \leqslant s^2 H'^2(s) \leqslant \beta^2 H^2(s). \tag{7.1}$$

Let $\bar{\eta}(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\bar{\eta}(x) \geqslant 0$ such that, for $r_1 > r_2 > 0$( $r_1$ will be determined later)

$$\bar{\eta}(x) \equiv 1 \text{ for } x \in B_{r_2}, \quad \bar{\eta}(x) \equiv 0 \text{ for } x \in B_{r_1}^c, \text{ and } |\nabla \bar{\eta}| \leqslant \frac{2}{r_1 - r_2}.$$

for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, setting $\eta(x) = \bar{\eta}(x - y) \geqslant 0$ and $0 \leqslant \eta^2 G(u) \in \mathscr{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with compact support in $B_{r_1}(y) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : u(x) \neq 0\}$. By (7.1) and (3.12) with $\varphi = \eta^2$ and $h = G$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla u \nabla (\eta^2 G(u)) dx \leqslant \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u^{p-1} u \eta^2 G(u) dx \leqslant \beta^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p-1} \eta^2 H^2(u) dx. \tag{7.2}$$

Noting that

$$\nabla u \nabla(\eta^2 G(u)) = |\nabla u|^2 {H'}^2(u)\eta^2 + 2\nabla u \nabla\eta G(u)\eta.$$

Also, by Young inequality and (7.1),

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla u \nabla \eta G(u)\eta| &= |\eta u^{-1/2} G^{1/2}(u)\nabla u||u^{1/2} G^{1/2}(u)\nabla\eta| \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{4}|\nabla u|^2 {H'}^2(u)\eta^2 + 4\beta^2|\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u).\end{aligned}$$

Then, it follows from (7.2) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2 |H'(u)|^2 \eta^2 dx \leqslant 16\beta^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p-1}\eta^2 H^2(u)dx\right).$$

Hence, by $\beta > 1$ and Hölder inequality we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(H(u)\eta)|^2 dx &\leqslant 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx + 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla u|^2|H'(u)|^2\eta^2 dx \\ &\leqslant 34\beta^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p-1}\eta^2 H^2(u)dx\right) \qquad (7.3) \\ &\leqslant 34\beta^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx + |\eta H(u)|_{2^*}^2 |u|_{2^*}^{p-1}|B_{r_1}|^\gamma\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma = \frac{2^*-p-1}{2^*}$ and $|B_{r_1}|$ denotes the volume of $B_{r_1}$. Taking $\beta = \frac{2^*}{2} \triangleq \beta_0$ and

$$r_1 = |B_1|^{-\frac{1}{N}} \left(68\beta_0^2|u|_{2^*}^{p-1} + 1\right)^{-\frac{\gamma}{N}} \leqslant \min\left\{|B_1|^{-\frac{1}{N}}, |B_1|^{-\frac{1}{N}} \left(68\beta_0^2|u|_{2^*}^{p-1}\right)^{-\frac{\gamma}{N}}\right\}. \qquad (7.4)$$

Obviously, $34\beta_0^2|u|_{2^*}^{p-1}|B_{r_1}|^\gamma \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$ and $|B_{r_1}| \leqslant 1$. Then, (7.3) with $\beta = \beta_0$ gives that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(H(u)\eta)|^2 dx \leqslant 68\beta_0^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx.$$

Hence, by Sobolev inequality and $\eta H(u) \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_{r_1}(y))$ as well as the definition of $\eta$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|H(u)|_{L^{2^*}(B_{r_2}(y))}^2 &\leqslant \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |H(u)\eta|^{2^*} dx\right)^{2/2^*} \leqslant S_0^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(H(u)\eta)|^2 dx \\ &\leqslant 68 S_0^{-1}\beta_0^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta|^2 H^2(u)dx \\ &\leqslant \left(\frac{C\beta_0}{r_1 - r_2}\right)^2 |H(u)|_{L^2(B_{r_1}(y))}^2, \qquad (7.5)\end{aligned}$$

where $C = \sqrt{68S_0^{-1}}$ and $S_0$ is the Sobolev constant, which depends only on $N$. By definition of $H(s) \equiv s^\beta$ if $M \to +\infty$. Noting that $\beta = \beta_0$ and $2\beta_0 = 2^*$, it follows from (7.5) that

$$|u|_{L^{2\beta_0^2}(B_{r_2}(y))}^{2\beta_0} \leqslant \left(\frac{C\beta_0}{r_1 - r_2}\right)^2 |u|_{L^{2^*}(B_{r_1}(y))}^{2\beta_0}. \qquad (7.6)$$

For each $i \geqslant 2$, let $r_i = \frac{2+2^{-i}}{4} r_1$ ( $r_1$ is given by (7.4)). Take $\bar{\eta}_i \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$\bar{\eta}_i(x) \equiv 1 \text{ for } x \in B_{r_{i+1}}, \quad \bar{\eta}_i(x) \equiv 0 \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus B_{r_i} \text{ and } |\nabla\bar{\eta}_i| \leqslant \frac{2}{r_i - r_{i+1}}.$$

Let $\delta = \frac{2\beta_0}{2\beta_0^2+1-p}$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$ by $p \in (1, \frac{N+2}{N-2})$. For $i \geqslant 2$, applying (7.3) with $\eta = \eta_i(x) \triangleq \bar{\eta}_i(x-y)$ and $\beta = \beta_i \triangleq \delta^{-i} > 1$, then noting that $|B_{r_i}| < |B_{r_1}| \leqslant 1$ and using Hölder inequality and the definition of $\bar{\eta}_i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(H(u)\eta_i)|^2 dx \leqslant 34\beta_i^2 \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla\eta_i|^2 H^2(u) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |u|^{p-1}\eta_i^2 H^2(u) dx \right) \\
&\leqslant 34\beta_i^2 \left[ \left( \frac{2}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^2 |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))} + |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))} |u|^{p-1}_{L^{2\beta_0^2}(B_{r_i}(y))} \right] \\
&\leqslant 34\beta_i^2 \left[ \left( \frac{2}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^2 + |u|^{p-1}_{L^{2\beta_0^2}(B_{r_2}(y))} \right] |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))} \\
&\leqslant 34\beta_i^2 \left[ \left( \frac{2}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{2}{r_1 - r_2} \right)^{(p-1)/\beta_0} |u|^{p-1}_{L^{2^*}(B_{r_1}(y))} \right] |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))} \text{ by (7.6)} \\
&\leqslant \left( \frac{\bar{C}\beta_i(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^2 |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{C}$ is a constant depending only on $N$ and $p$. Since $\eta_i H(u) \in \mathscr{D}_0^{1,2}(B_{r_i}(y))$, it follows from the Sobolev inequality that

$$|H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*}(B_{r_{i+1}}(y))} \leqslant S_0^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla(H(u)\eta_i)|^2 dx \leqslant \left( \frac{\bar{C}_1\beta_i(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^2 |H(u)|^2_{L^{2^*\delta}(B_{r_i}(y))}$$

where $\bar{C}_1 = \bar{C}\sqrt{S_0^{-1}}$ depends only on $N$ and $p$. Let $M \to +\infty$, and $H(u) = u^{\beta_i}$, then

$$|u|_{L^{2^*\beta_i}(B_{r_{i+1}}(y))} \leqslant \left( \frac{\bar{C}_1\beta_i(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_i - r_{i+1}} \right)^{1/\beta_i} |u|_{L^{2^*\beta_{i-1}}(B_{r_i}(y))}.$$

We can now perform the Moser iterations in a standard way and get that

$$\begin{aligned}
|u|_{L^{2^*\beta_i}(B_{r_{i+1}}(y))} &\leqslant \prod_{l=2}^{i} \left( \frac{\bar{C}_1\beta_l(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_l - r_{l+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta_l}} |u|_{L^{2^*\beta_1}(B_{r_2}(y))} \\
&= (\frac{2}{\delta})^{f(i)} \left( \frac{8\bar{C}_1(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_1} \right)^{g(i)} |u|_{L^{2^*\beta_1}(B_{r_2}(y))}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

where $f(i) = \frac{2\delta^2}{1-\delta} + \frac{\delta^3(1-\delta^{i-2})}{(1-\delta)^2} + \frac{i\delta^{i+1}}{1-\delta} \xrightarrow{i} \frac{2\delta^2-\delta^3}{(1-\delta)^2}$ and $g(j) = \frac{\delta^2(1-\delta^{i-1})}{1-\delta} \xrightarrow{i} \frac{\delta^2}{1-\delta}$. Since $2^*\beta_1 = 2\beta_0^2 + 1 - p < 2\beta_0^2$, by Hölder inequality, (7.4) and (7.6), we have

$$|u|_{L^{2^*\beta_1}(B_{r_2}(y))} \leqslant |B_{r_2}|^{\frac{2\beta_0^2}{p-1}} |u|_{L^{2\beta_0^2}(B_{r_2}(y))} \leqslant |u|_{L^{2\beta_0^2}(B_{r_2}(y))} \leqslant \left( \frac{C\beta_0}{r_1 - r_2} \right)^{1/\beta_0} |u|_{2^*}.$$

This and (7.7) show that

$$|u|_{L^{2^*\beta_i}(B_{r_1/2}(y))} \leqslant |u|_{L^{2^*\beta_i}(B_{r_{i+1}}(y))} \leqslant (\frac{2}{\delta})^{f(i)} \left( \frac{8\bar{C}_1(1 + |u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_1} \right)^{g(i)} \left( \frac{\frac{16}{7}C\beta_0}{r_1} \right)^{1/\beta_0} |u|_{2^*}.$$

Let $i \to +\infty$, and noting (7.4), There exist positive constant $C_1(p,N), C_2(p,N)$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u|_{L^\infty(B_{r_1/2}(y))} &\leqslant (\frac{2}{\delta})^{\frac{2\delta^2-\delta^3}{(1-\delta)^2}} \left(\frac{8\bar{C}_1(1+|u|_{2^*}^{(p-1)/2})}{r_1}\right)^{\frac{\delta^2}{1-\delta}} \left(\frac{\frac{16}{7}C\beta_0}{r_1}\right)^{1/\beta_0} |u|_{2^*} \\
&\leqslant (\frac{2}{\delta})^{\frac{2\delta^2-\delta^3}{(1-\delta)^2}} \left(\frac{(8\bar{C}_1+\frac{16}{7}C\beta_0)(1+|u|_{2^*}^{\frac{p-1}{2}})}{r_1}\right)^{\frac{\delta^2}{1-\delta}+\frac{1}{\beta_0}} |u|_{2^*} \\
&\leqslant (\frac{2}{\delta})^{\frac{2\delta^2-\delta^3}{(1-\delta)^2}} \left(|B_1|^{\frac{1}{N}}(8\bar{C}_1+\frac{16}{7}C\beta_0)(1+|u|_{2^*}^{\frac{p-1}{2}})\left(68\beta_0^2|u|_{2^*}^{p-1}+1\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{N}}\right)^{\frac{\delta^2}{1-\delta}+\frac{1}{\beta_0}} |u|_{2^*} \\
&\leqslant C_1(p,N)(1+|u|_{2^*}^{C_2(p,N)})|u|_{2^*}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $r_1$ is fixed by (7.4), we have

$$|u|_\infty \leqslant C_1(p,N)\left(1+|u|_{2^*}^{C_2(p,N)}\right)|u|_{2^*}. \quad \square$$

# References

[1] A. Ambrosetti. On Schrodinger-Poisson Systems. *Milan J. Math*, 76(1):257–274, DEC 2008.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and D. Ruiz. Multiple bound states for the Schrödinger-Poisson problem. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 10(3):391–404, 2008.

[3] A. Azzollini, P. d'Avenia, and A. Pomponio. On the schrödinger-maxwell equations under the effect of a general nonlinear term. *preprint.*

[4] A. Azzollini and A. Pomponio. Ground state solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 345(1):90–108, 2008.

[5] T. Bartsch, A. Pankov, and Z. Q. Wang. Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with steep potential well. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 3(4):549–569, 2001.

[6] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. An eigenvalue problem for the Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 11(2):283–293, 1998.

[7] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. Solitary waves of the nonlinear klein-gordon equation coupled with maxwell equations. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 14:409–420, 2002.

[8] F. A. Berezin and M. A. Shubin. *The Schrödinger equation.* Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1991.

[9] G.M. Coclite. A multiplicity result for the nonlinear Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Commun. Appl. Anal.*, 7(2-3):417–423, 2003.

[10] T. D'Aprile and D. Mugnai. Solitary waves for nonlinear Klein-Gordon-Maxwell and Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 134(5):893–906, 2004.

[11] T. D'Aprile and J. Wei. On bound states concentrating on spheres for the maxwell-schródinger equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37:321–342, 2005.

[12] P. d'Avenia. Non-radially symmetric solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equation coupled with Maxwell equations. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 2(2):177–192, 2002.

[13] H. Egnell. Asymptotic results for finite energy solutions of semilinear elliptic equations. *J. Differential Equations*, 98(1):34–56, 1992.

[14] D. Gilbarg and N.S. Trudinger. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order.* Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1998 edition.

[15] Y.S. Jiang and H.S. Zhou. Bound states for a stationary nonlinnear Schrödinger-Poisson systems with sing-changing potential in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Acta. Math. Sci.*, 29B(4):1095–1104, 2009.

[16] H. Kikuchi. On the existence of a solution for elliptic system related to the Maxwell-Schrödinger equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 67(5):1445–1456, 2007.

[17] D. Ruiz. The Schrödinger-Poisson equation under the effect of a nonlinear local term. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 237(2):655–674, 2006.

[18] D. Ruiz and G. Vaira. Cluster solutions for the Schrödinger-Poisson-Slater problem around a local minimum of the potential. *preprint.*

[19] Neil S. Trudinger. Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of Riemannian structures on compact manifolds. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (3)*, 22:265–274, 1968.

[20] Z.P. Wang and H.S. Zhou. Positive solution for a nonlinear stationary Schrödinger-Poisson system in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 18(4):809–816, 2007.

[21] M.B. Yang, Z.F. Shen, and Y.H. Ding. Multiple semiclassical solutions for the nonlinear maxwellcschrödinger system. *Nonlinear Anal.*, in press.

[22] L.G. Zhao and F.K. Zhao. On the existence of solutions for the Schrödinger-Poisson equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 346(1):155–169, 2008.